

REMARKS

In view of the following remarks, reexamination and reconsideration of this application, withdrawal of the rejections, and formal notification of the allowability of all claims as presented are earnestly solicited. Claims 11-15 are pending. In response to the Office Action, Claims 1-10 have been cancelled and new Claims 11-15 have been added. New Claims 11-15 include matter previously recited in cancelled Claims 1-10 and also find support throughout the as-filed Specification and the Drawings, and no new matter has been added. Accordingly, it is believed that the pending claims now further define patentable subject matter over the references cited by the Examiner and notice to such effect is requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. §102

The Office Action indicates that Claims 1-10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,700,773 to Adriaansen *et al.* ("Adriaansen"). In response, Claims 1-10 have been cancelled. In addition, new Claims 11-15 have been added to more clearly indicate patentable aspects of the present invention. New Claim 11 includes matter previously recited in Claims 1 and 7-10. Additionally, new Claim 11 also recites a "latching device being further configured for moving at least one of the first surface and the second surface of the peripheral device away from the central unit in response to a user input such that a user may grasp at least one external edge of the peripheral device and pivot the peripheral device to at least one of the first operative position and the second operative position." This element finds support throughout the Specification and the Figures such as, for example, in Figures 4a and 4b and at page 9, lines 6-15 of the as-filed Specification. Furthermore, new Claims 12-15 include matter previously recited in Claims 2-5. Accordingly, no new matter has been added.

Thus, Claim 11 (and Claims 12-15 depending therefrom) now explicitly recite a data processing system comprising a pivotable peripheral device comprising opposing first and second surfaces and a latching device configured for moving at least one of the first surface and the second surface of the peripheral device away from a central unit of the data processing system in response to a user input (such as the depression of the push buttons (405f), as described at page 9, lines 6-13 of the Specification). Thus, by actuating the recited latching mechanism, a user may grasp at least one external edge of the peripheral device and pivot the peripheral device to at least one of the first operative position and the second operative position relative to the central unit of the data processing system.

Adriaansen does not teach or suggest such a latching mechanism. In contrast, Adriaansen discloses that the end (177e) of the module (177) must be lifted (manually, by the user) in an upward direction away from the main body after the release triggers (194) are activated. *See* Adriaansen, at column 18, lines 43-45. Applicants respectfully submit that for a rejection to be proper under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), the cited reference “must teach every element of the claim.” *See* MPEP §2131. As discussed above, Adriaansen does not teach or suggest “a latching device configured for moving at least one of the first surface and the second surface of the peripheral device away from a central unit of the data processing system.”

Thus, Applicant submits that Claim 11 is not anticipated by Adriaansen under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). Applicant respectfully submits that the cited reference does not disclose, teach, or suggest a latching device configured for moving the peripheral device away from a central unit of the data processing system as is claimed in Claim 11. In addition, the pending claims depending from new Claim 11 are patentably distinct from the cited reference for at least the same reasons stated above.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, Adriaansen **does not** teach, suggest, or provide motivation for the embodiments of the present invention, as now claimed in Claim 11, and Claims 12-15 depending therefrom. Accordingly, in view of the above differences between the Applicants' invention and the cited reference, the Applicants submit that the present invention, as defined by the pending claims, is patentable over the references cited in the Office Action. As such, for the reasons set forth above, Claims 11-15 are believed to be in condition for immediate allowance and notice to such effect is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest opportunity.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jason O. Piche/

Jason O. Piche, Attorney Reg. No. 53,468

Customer Number 25299
IBM Corporation
IP Law Dept. YXSA/B002
P.O. Box 12195
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

Phone: 919-543-1467
Fax: 919-254-2649